

OCT 16 1931

telegrams: Mosque,  
Woking.

The

Telephone: Woking,  
679.

# Islamic Review

Edited by AL-HAJ KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN.

XIX.]

[No. 8

RABI'U'L-AWWAL 1350 A.H.

AUGUST, 1931 A.C.

Subscription, 10s.

Single Copies, 1s.

## CONTENTS

His Exalted Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad-Deccan The Princes of Hyderabad-Deccan at the Shah Jehan Mosque, Woking . . . . .	Frontispieces
	PAGE
The Imamat in Islam. (The London Nizamiah Mosque) 265	
A Question for the Serious Consideration of the Modernists . . . . .	267
Human Faculties and their Development. By Al-Hajj Khwaja Kamalu 'd-Din . . . . .	270
Denial of the Qur-án: A Logical Inconsistency. By Khwaja Kamalu 'd-Din . . . . .	279
Muhammad in the New Testament. XI. The Son of Man According to the Jewish Apocalypses. By Professor 'Abdu 'l-Ahad Dāwūd, B.D. . . . .	282
Notes . . . . .	293
The Sword of Muhammad—The Sword of Jesus— The Sword in Legend—The Mysteriousness of the Christian Attitude—A Lesson for Muslims	
Correspondence . . . . .	298

## THE HOLY QUR-ÁN

With English Translation and Commentary, printed on high-class India paper, and bound in green flexible leather, price £2 10s.; Pluvinsin, £2; cloth, £1 10s. Postage and packing for all qualities: United Kingdom, 1s.; abroad, 2s. Prospectus and sample pages sent free on application. Apply to "Islamic Review," The Mosque, Woking, England, or to "Islamic Review" Office, Azeez Manzil, Lahore, India.

PUBLISHED BY

**THE WOKING MUSLIM MISSION  
AND LITERARY TRUST, THE  
SHAH JEHAN MOSQUE,  
WOKING, ENGLAND**

Kindly quote your Subscriber's Number when corresponding.





HIS EXALTED HIGHNESS THE NIZAM OF HYDERABAD-DECCAN,  
INDIA

Who munificently gave £60,000 towards the building of the London Nizamiah Mosque, for which a site costing £32,000 has been bought by the Nizamiah Mosque Trust (Trustees: Lord Headley (Chairman), Nawab Mehdi Yar Jung Bahadur, Sir Abbas 'Ali Baig, and Khwaja Kamalu 'd-Din) in West Kensington, London.

*We draw the attention of our readers to the opening article in this issue on the question of the Imamat of the London Nizamiah Mosque.—ED. I.R.*

THE SONS OF HIS EXALTED HIGHNESS THE NIZAM AT THE MOSQUE, WOKING



A FRATERNAL GROUP

Taken on the occasion of an AT HOME given by the Muslim Society of Great Britain in honour of Prince AZAM JAH BAHADUR and PRINCE MOAZZAM JAH BAHADUR,  
THE SONS OF HIS EXALTED HIGHNESS THE NIZAM OF HYDERABAD-DECCAN, INDIA, at the Shah Jehan Mosque, Woking, on Sunday, June 7, 1931.  
Front Row from right to left, counting from 6th to 18th: Brigadier Osman Yar ud Dawla Bahadur, Mrs. Salwey White, Abdul Majid (Imām of the Mosque), Prince  
Aly Khan (Son of H.H. the Aga Khan), Prince Moazzam Jah Bahadur, Prince Azam Jah Bahadur, Lord Headley, Lady Headley, Mrs. H. Buchanan-Hamilton,  
Mr. H. Lovegrove, Mrs. Quraishi, Madame Léon, Prof. H. Léon,

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ  
شَهِادَةُ مُحَمَّدٍ وَسَلَّمَ عَلَى رُسُولِ الْكَبِيرِ

THE

# ISLAMIC REVIEW

RABI'U 'L-AWWAL, 1350 A.H.

VOL. XIX.

AUGUST, 1931 A.C.

No. 8

## THE IMAMAT IN ISLAM

(THE LONDON NIZAMIAH MOSQUE)

ISLAM is the only religion which does not permit of sectarianism, and that simply because the Holy Prophet left it perfect in form, and did everything necessary to establish and maintain its purity through the generations to come. But such is not the case with other religions. They lost their purity of teaching almost at their very inception, and naturally tended to branch off in widely different directions. We admit that, as regards matters of secondary importance in our Faith, there are various schools of thought, but these are not concerned with the essentials of the Faith. Unfortunately, in India Muslims live cheek by jowl with Hinduism, which, like Christianity, is hopelessly split up into hundreds of sects, the adherents of each regarding those of the rest as non-Hindus. A similar view is sometimes expressed of Islam by those not Muslims, but without a shred of justification. We are proud to declare, as has been declared often in these pages, that ours is a Faith without sects. We may be Shias and Sunnies, or belong to any subsection of these, like Hanafies, Shafies, Mutazillies, etc., but we are all one and the same—we are Muslims. We take the liberty of quoting the following extract from a letter recently written by Khwaja Kamalu 'd-Din Sahib to an inquirer, and we hope that his words will open the eyes of those belonging

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

to other persuasions who decline to set foot in another's church, even for the worship of God. For instance, the London Nizamiah Mosque owes its very existence to the munificence of His Exalted Highness the Nizam of Deccan, and his vigilant eye perceived that that Mosque was to be erected in a country groaning under the curse of Christian sectarianism. He wanted to set an example for Christians to follow; therefore he opened the door of the Mosque to every so-called sect in the Faith, and in so doing carried out precisely the injunction and the Spirit of Islam.

" . . . As for saying prayers, I would say my prayer behind any Imām of any sect. The so-called sects never come in my way. Of course I would not say my prayers behind a person who regards other Muslims as Kāfir and treats them as outside the pale of Islam. According to my convictions everyone who declares his faith in the formula of Islam—' Kalima-sharif '—is a Muslim, and can conduct prayers, and will be followed by me, provided he is of good character and regards no Muslim as Kāfir, to whatever sect he may belong. Everyone who works at Woking is of the same conviction. . . .

" My illness has, however, given me many a lesson. The responsibilities of the Imām at Woking are increasing day by day. They are already multifarious in their nature, and I am anxiously looking forward to the time when, on the completion of the London Nizamiah Mosque, the new incumbent, as its Imām, will be able to relieve us of many of the duties which are at present crowding on us, since it would, of course, be next to impossible for the Woking Imām to attend to the duties pertaining to the London Nizamiah Mosque. The choice of the Imām, no doubt, is in itself a problem. Though the question of sect does not arise, yet the Hanafi persuasion is universally accepted in minor matters in the world of Islam. My personal opinion is that the London Nizamiah Mosque Imām should be a Hanafi. The real question in the matter of his selection will be that of his abilities and knowledge. I wish to see the Mosque as a beacon-light of Islam set in the midst of London; and to this end the Imām of that Mosque should

## **QUESTION FOR SERIOUS CONSIDERATION**

be not only steeped in Islam but also an intelligent student of modern thought. . . .

own estate said "KHWAJA KAMALU 'D-DIN."

In this connection a copy of the letter reproduced below, written by the secretary of the Woking Muslim Mission and Literary Trust, Lahore, to the editor, *The Star*, Allahabad, India, will be found of interest. The letter reads:

DEAR SIR.—

In your issue of last month one of your correspondents made a very pertinent remark on the above subject in the columns of "Notes and Views" when he said that the Imamat of the London Nizamiah Mosque should not be confined to any particular sect.

Recently Khwaja Kamalu 'd-Din Sahib, the founder of the Woking Muslim Mission, wrote a letter to a friend of his in England, out of which I take the following extracts<sup>1</sup> for the enlightenment of my brethren in Islam. The extracts put the question of Imamat in Islam in its truest form. We rue the day when sectarian absurdities became incorporated in Islam and it will be a day of rejoicings for us when we shall see sectarian narrow-mindedness uprooted from among ourselves. The Khwaja Sahib has been writing on the subject very boldly and continuously since 1920. He believes in no sect in Islam and so he has preached it. We shall do the greatest possible service to our faith if we can act upon the principle.

Yours faithfully,

*Secretary, The Woking Muslim Mission and Literary Trust.*

## A QUESTION FOR THE SERIOUS CONSIDERATION OF THE MODERNISTS

IF Jesus is entitled to our allegiance as a guide and teacher, we cannot reasonably deny the same to Muhammad and the other prophets of the world. There were days when the Son of Mary was accepted by most of his followers as the Son of God, though he was only the last of the race of similar gods. Many a virgin before Mary was reputed to have given birth to sons of God, who, according to the Mystery Cult, came to give their lives for man's salvation. They were put to death,

<sup>1</sup> These extracts are reproduced above.—ED. I.R.

like Jesus, on a Friday afternoon which preceded Easter Sunday, when they rose from the dead and ascended into heaven with a promise to come again. These stories have now been proved to be myth and fiction, and that of Jesus is proving to be no exception. The Modernists, like the Unitarians, have rejected all belief in his Divinity. They accept him as a prophet and a guide. But the world saw other prophets. If the Nazarene from the East can command Western allegiance, why should not such be accorded other prophets of the East? Why should Muhammad be dubbed an imposter, if he led a most exemplary life consistently pure in every way, and left us the Book most suited for human guidance? On the other hand, we know very little of Jesus. The Gospel record is all we have and its teachings are not complete; and what there are hardly comply with the exigencies of modern life. The greater portion, especially the Sermon on the Mount, was of local and topical application. It was only an utterance of a recluse, asking us to make a total renunciation of all our worldly concerns and demanding from us the observance of many impracticable things. Above all, the Sermon is not authentic. The Arabian Prophet, on the other hand, has a much stronger claim to prophethood. He adopts logic and utility as his basis, and he is the only member of the blessed race of Divine Messengers who gives us, as it were, a talisman, the best example for all the ups and downs of life, leaving us a Book—the only Book of Revelation which can claim authenticity.

We need both example and precept for our guidance and a prophet from God comes to meet this need. But time has changed all that the former prophets originally left to us for our guidance, with the notable exception of Muhammad. How, then, can we, with any show of reason, overlook Muhammad's claim as a prophet? The whole of Nature bears testimony to the above logic. Whenever anything useful disappears from the earth or becomes vitiated in its use, Providence sends either a substitute or something better. The Qur-án sets forth the same argument to substantiate its claims as a Revelation from God. Either the Moral Governor should keep things

## QUESTION FOR SERIOUS CONSIDERATION

of utility intact, or a fresh supply should come from Him on their disappearance. If the Divine Economy deemed it necessary to send revelations from time to time, and if the Laws of God and His Ways remain unchanged, how could He keep silent, especially after Jesus, when all the religious lore that had come into the world before had either disappeared or become corrupt? If the Formal Church did not represent the real teachings of Jesus, as the Modernists say, and if error crept into those teachings some time in the fourth or fifth century of his era, when they became tainted, as history shows, the loss should have been looked to and made up then and there. The Modernists of to-day have spring-cleaned, as it were, the whole house of Christianity. They have found all its old assets damaged and broken and the house full of pagan furniture. But all this occurred some fifteen hundred years ago. Why, then, did Revelation remain in abeyance when it was most urgently needed? Jesus has been accepted as a prophet by the Modernist, like the prophets of ancient days. He came to reform the Faith of Moses, which undoubtedly had become subject to human interpolation. Should not God raise up another teacher if the Faith of the former met a fate like that of Moses? The Modernists' position is untenable and unnatural too, if they take the work of God in their hands. They admit that the official Church has become corrupt. They come with a genuine desire to reform it; but they insult Divine Providence and usurp His functions. Human guidance has been nothing to Him for many centuries; now He has been pleased to inspire the Modernists to perform His own holy task. But the reforms they seek were ready when the need for them arose. The advent of the Qur-án was most opportune. It came at a time when the whole horizon of the world had become darkened with the darkness of ignorance and wickedness. The Church of Jesus also had become corrupt and decrepit at this period, as Sir William Muir admits. The Qur-án came to reform it. It declared that the Bible had been tampered with and was not authentic. It declared that Jesus was only a prophet of God and a man and not His Son, and that his ascension to Heaven was only a spiritual

phenomenon which occurred also in the case of Elijah and other prophets. It denounced the Trinity and deprecated other polytheistic teachings of the Church. It also declared that man entered into the world with a pure nature. He came sinless and perfect, and evil was only an after-acquisition. The Holy Book lays down a general principle. It says that everything that comes from God is good, but our mishandling of it converts it into evil. The Book also says that heaven is neither a definite locality nor a place of physical enjoyment. Its extent coincides with the borders of heaven and earth.<sup>1</sup>

In short, I see nothing in Modernism which goes against the Church doctrines that was not inculcated in the Qur-án. Moreover, many of their tenets do not come from Jesus, but are found in the Qur-án. Jesus remained silent on these points, but it is the Qur-án that sheds the true light on every subject. The Modernists in reality follow Muhammad and not Jesus. They father on the Son of Mary the principles that belong to Muhammad and not to Jesus (Peace of God be on them!). It is high time for the Modernists to study the Qur-án from this point of view.

## HUMAN FACULTIES AND THEIR DEVELOPMENT

By AL-HAJJ KHWAJA KAMALU 'D-DIN

### DIFFERENT CONCEPTIONS AS TO OUR FACULTIES

ALL human success depends upon cultivating the sources of Nature and working out its hidden powers. Every thing is full of potentialities that come to the surface automatically. They are on their course to advancement. From ethereal specks up to plasmic congeries in the human brain the initial substance passes through various stages of evolution in order to bring forth in us consciousness which is capable of proceeding yet farther. But here there comes a great divergence between the physical world and that of human consciousness.

<sup>1</sup> Holy Qur-án, iii. 132.

## HUMAN FACULTIES AND DEVELOPMENT

If the former needed no guidance and proceeded instinctively on lines already marked out, human consciousness, though so extensive and vast in its growth, needs definite external instructions for each and every further step. All conscious faculties in the human brain remain a hidden treasure unless developed from without. They find no instructions as to further progress from within the mind of man. Philosophy and religion before Islam did not do justice to man in this respect; they affected human destiny for thousands of years and checked its progress. The ancient world saw nothing excellent in man, nor could they find any good purpose for us in the world. According to Hindu philosophy there was no reality in anything. All was illusion—"Maya"; while our happiness, they thought, lay in our absolute divorce from it. According to the Buddhists, trouble and tribulation abounded everywhere, while man's salvation lay in his absolute annihilation. The Zoroastrian religion made evil as essential as good. The Universe, it taught, was in the hands of Ormazd and Ahriman—the god of Good and the god of Evil. The Greeks spoke of revengeful Nemesis with men as playthings in her hands. But the Church theology in the West surpassed every other school of thought in this respect. It taught that sin was inseparably attached to us, since we were born in it. Such teachings could hardly allow for or further any advancement. India, however, did not pay much practical heed to the Brahmanical or Buddhist philosophy. But the time came when belief in the theory of "Maya"—*illusion*—made the people indifferent even to their own safety when they became an easy prey to foreign invasion.

If the Church in the West failed to find any good in man, modern Rationalism has taken the opposite view, declaring that man possesses the highest capabilities. The two beliefs thus stand poles apart and to a certain extent are productive of evil results. If the latter overrated our faculties and, acting on the theory of the survival of the fittest, approved even aggressiveness on our part, when indulged in, to subordinate and exploit others, to further our ends, the former retarded our progress on material grounds. But both spoke the partial

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

truth, seeing that man is neither destitute of good nor free from evil tendencies.

The Holy Qur-án gives, however, a true description of human nature. Man, it says,<sup>1</sup> is endowed with the best of qualities and can make unlimited progress, but he may also go astray. Yet the Book also gives us good tidings in this respect. We can avail ourselves of the former, it says, and escape the latter if we believe (in certain truths) and do good accordingly.<sup>2</sup> We have risen from animality and inherit animal inclinations which would create evil if not properly controlled. But they are also the finest bedrock of a splendid moral edifice.

### CONSCIOUSNESS A NEW FACULTY

Consciousness primarily appears in the animal world in its tangible form. Every animal possesses passions. But they differ in their form and measure in different animals. Some of the passions that are observed prominently developed in one animal are extinct in another. We do not perceive, for example, the ferociousness of the tiger in the cow, nor the pig's dirty habits in the cat. Different animals are thus embodiments of different passions; but all passions find a place in human consciousness. Man is, as it were, a moving zoo. His mind is like a menagerie, with a collection of wild animals in various cages—his brain cells. A man of strong character is like an able custodian of these animals, who trains them to serve him faithfully when fit occasions arise. He has trained them and controls them. But an uncultured mind falls an easy prey to them. On the least excitement, he gives vent to his animal consciousness. He becomes an incarnation of the animal whose passion takes hold of him for the time being. The camel, for example, lives chiefly on thorns and exhibits the worst type of anger; but man may well surpass the brute if he does not know how to control such crude passions. Thus untrained minds coincide with different classes of animals, according to the ruling passions of the animal in them. They are pig, fox, dog, cat, tiger, and the like

<sup>1</sup> Holy Qur-án, xcvi. 4, 5.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., xcvi. 6.

## HUMAN FACULTIES AND DEVELOPMENT

in human form. True humanity lies in the subjugation of these animal passions within us. We must emerge from animality. We must learn, first, how to make the best use of these passions and bring them under our control. But our mind is capable of going yet farther. It has been fashioned after God's mind. It needs guidance in order to follow His ways. Modern civilization seeks to do the same, but in a strictly material sense. Its aim is to achieve all that is observed materially in Nature. We find therein the best specimens of intellect, precision, regularity, and order. But we also observe liberality, compassion, and mercy in Nature. Equity and justice are also working side by side with economy. Again, Nature exhibits limitless precaution. Ample provision is always at its disposal for working out its designs. Beauty and sublimity pervade it everywhere. We aspire to achieve all this. We cannot, in fact, complete our progress without possessing these qualities of the Worker in Nature from Whom guidance must come if we are to learn His ways. The Qur-án claims to be this guidance. It may seem a bold assertion, but the claims of the Book appear to me to be well substantiated.

In the first place, the human mind gives birth to individual consciousness. It is evolved from animal consciousness, which does not appreciate individual rights of ownership. The Book defines these rights and then widens this phase of mind into family consciousness by teaching us rules of domestic life. Then it enjoins us to observe charity and fellow-feeling in various ways. It produces in our mind national and racial consciousness. We begin to feel for others as we feel for ourselves or for those who stand near to us in various relationships. Ethics thus become converted into high morality, which, in its turn, evolves into spirituality with the spirit of sacrifice as its chief feature. Thus we pass through various stages of the soul's development up to Cosmic Consciousness, when the human mind becomes merged in the Divine Mind.

But there are other avenues of progress before us besides moral and spiritual advancement. We have to learn various material sciences, and each science opens before us a new world. There is in us a capacity to cultivate religion, philosophy, art,

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

poetry, and many other æsthetic tastes. We have to cultivate our occult powers as well. We have also to make researches in the various realms of the Universe; and all these activities should be among the pursuits of a Muslim—as the Qur-án says. If a religion that claims to have come from God does not invite our attention to all these branches of progress, it is not worthy of its name, and the Book which it cites as its authority from the Most High is but folklore.

### THE GARDEN OF ADAM

Human nature is a wonderful garden. It is full of trees with fruits of every taste and quality. But the tree becomes a forbidden tree, which does not grow as it should. The garden of Adam (man) was his own nature, with innumerable capacities for good in it, but with a capability for doing evil as well. His story, as given in the Qur-án in the form of allegory, explains the whole case at once, beautifully and rationally. It places man on such a high pedestal that he even receives homage from God's angels—the sentient beings who, according to the Qur-ánic version, move all forces of Nature. It is the highest position that man can attain when he becomes the ruler of Nature and learns its secrets and hidden things. The story speaks also of his expulsion from this state of greatness and bliss, when he deviates from the right path by tasting, metaphorically, the forbidden fruit in the garden, or in other words makes wrong use of his faculties.

### SATAN

We read also of another being, in the same garden, who tempts man thus to go astray, and that being is Satan. Whatever may be our conception of Satan, whether he be a separate entity and the spirit of evil, or only another name for our own capacity for sin, we cannot ignore those evil influences which have been ascribed to him in the Holy Scriptures. We are often led wrong by invisible agencies, called, in the Qur-án, "Khannás." These may emanate from men, or from the unseen world. Invisibility is no proof of non-existence. We believe in numerous things which we cannot see. If temptation

## HUMAN FACULTIES AND DEVELOPMENT

to evil has existed from the very beginning, and if evil arises when we misuse things in any way, its birth must co-exist with their birth. If Adam is the first man he must have had some tempter with him in the garden. If everything can become subject to evil, the Qur-án has then disclosed a great truth when it warns us against the working of Satan, which is everywhere. Psycho-physiology admits the human heart to be the mover of all actions, be they good or bad. There is no reason, therefore, to laugh at a tradition of the Prophet that says that Satan sometimes rules our hearts. But Satan, in the words of the Qur-án, says that those who submit to the Divine Laws are not under his control.<sup>1</sup> The Book says the same thing on another occasion when it declares that a person who fails to remember God will have the devil as his associate,<sup>2</sup> and that he is the worst associate.<sup>3</sup>

### THE PROBLEM OF GOOD AND EVIL

But the Book ascribes all immorality also to something else, and that is our inclination to evil, and the whole question thus revolves on what is our definition of good and evil. The genesis of evil has baffled the human mind from the beginning, but the Qur-án tells us the solution of the problem. A Book that came to develop human faculties on right lines should warn us against the things that create evil, seeing that they tend to destroy all our faculties. Everything in the Universe serves some useful purpose—utilized in a specified measure. If it is food in one form, or quantity for a species, it acts as a poison in another. For example, the quantity of water necessary to quench a camel's thirst will kill a man if he were to try to take it in one drink. Again, animals do certain things in certain ways, but it would amount to criminality or some dire social offence if we were to follow their example. Larceny, or the misappropriation of other's property, is no wrong in animals, since they neither possess a sense of ownership nor individual consciousness. There is another phase of the question: Nothing in itself is wrong; it is change of scene or occasion that makes it so. Evil does not come from

<sup>1</sup> Holy Qur-án, xv. 40.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., xlivi. 36.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., xlivi. 38.

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

God, but it is our misapplication of things that makes them evil. Opium, for instance, works wonders in alleviating pain, but it becomes poison if taken for food. Everything in Nature is a blessing, but it becomes a curse when misused. The same may be said of our passions. They become virtues or wickedness according to occasion. They benefit human society in one way, but they destroy its fabric in another. Good and evil are thus different measures of the same thing. Things have inherent qualities which they must exhibit, but it is the occasion that gives them the one character or the other. Fire must burn and consume everything put into it. It is of immense good to us, but it does immense harm as well, if misapplied.

No doubt we acquire knowledge of propriety both of occasion and measure in the use of things through our own experience, when we have mishandled or misapplied them. This occurs often enough on the material plane, but we could not have gained of ourselves the knowledge that has come to us through Revelation on the moral plane. God is the Creator of things that function diversely. Good and Evil must, therefore, be subject to His premeasurement as their Maker, since different measures of the same thing give it different characters. These measures have been described as several laws concerning the thing in question, contained in all the Books of Revelation. The word Law, broadly speaking, has the same meaning everywhere. Its function is to allow one form or measure of a thing or action and disallow another, in science, society, or religion. The whole universe bears testimony to this. Things when combined in the prescribed measure or proportions give desirable results. Ordinary laboratory work is proof of this. Divine Revelation comes to enlighten us on things concerning which we, of ourselves, could know nothing. If God created things and premeasured them thus, He, in a way, lies under an obligation to us to send us such knowledge.

### MUSLIM ARTICLES OF FAITH

It is therefore an article of faith with Muslims to believe in such measures as coming from God. Wrong measures are

## HUMAN FACULTIES AND DEVELOPMENT

deemed crime in the province of Law, which doubtless opens the door to punishment, yet Law did not come to punish us, but to save us from the penalty of wrong as defined by it. It therefore cannot be taken as a messenger of punishment simply because it warns us against punishment. But so it appeared to St. Paul. He laboured under a confusion of ideas in his zeal in Romanizing Christianity. He maligned a blessing of God, i.e. Law, in order to introduce the pagan dogma of Blood and Atonement into the simple faith of Jesus, which was no other than the religion of "Law and Obedience," i.e. Islam. Thus belief in the said premeasurement as Divine Law is an article of faith with a Muslim. The other articles of faith in Islam are like unto it. They are as follows: (1) Allah, the Maker of Law. (2) Angels, the functionaries of His Law. (3) Books, the repositories of His Laws. (4) Messengers, the first receivers of the Law. (5) The Hereafter, the time of Requital to meet the ends of the Law. (6) The Resurrection, our rising from the grave to begin a new life—according to our obedience or disobedience to the Law in this life.

## THE QUR-ÁN CAME TO PREACH KNOWLEDGE

Divine laws rule the whole world, and the purpose of the Holy Book was to infuse into us the spirit of obedience to them. Ignorance of the Law would naturally create trouble as tending to inordinacy in our conduct of life, and thus affecting the very growth of our faculties. But knowledge can save us from any such consequence and help us to thrive. The first Revelation received by the Holy Prophet on the very day when the mantle of prophethood fell on his shoulders disclosed this same truth.<sup>1</sup> It came to raise man to the "Honour" he deserved. It referred to "inordinacy" as the obstacle in his path to that honour. But it spoke also of "Knowledge" as the only efficacious means for eradicating inordinacy from our nature. What a grand and glorious pronouncement for a Revelation to make at the very outset. It puts the whole case in a nutshell. It speaks of the honour

<sup>1</sup> Holy Qur-án, xcvi. 3-6.

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

to which we are destined, but which is withheld from us on account of what the Book terms "inordinacy"—that is to say, our disregard of proper limits in our conduct. It is the mover of all evil and it can be removed from us by attaining knowledge. The story of Adam, as given in the Qur-án, is intended to explain the honour of which the first Revelation speaks, while the rest of the Book is an eloquent commentary on it. The glorious Qur-án comes as the charter of the kingdom of God on the Earth that is to be given to man, the kingdom prayed for by Jesus, and here enters a doctrinal difference between Formal Christianity and Islam. The former makes sin unavoidable. It launches all its militancy against sin, which, as the Church maintains, entered into the world through eating of the tree of knowledge and makes atonement the only remedy. But Islam makes the same knowledge our invincible bulwark against evil, which is disregard of the Divine limitations and the committing of inordinacy. It arises from the animality in us, since animals cannot respect the propriety of God's limitations simply for want of knowledge. Knowledge will enable us to appreciate the said "Measures" and prepare us to fight against all the forces of the Devil, who is a reality. Neither our belief in salvation by atonement nor our participation in the Holy Communion can purge our nature of sin.

### QUR-ÁNIC CONCEPTION OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

Righteousness does not lie in doing meaningless things which are presumed to be pleasing to the Deity. All our religious observances must also stand on a basis of truth and utility. Virtue, according to the Qur-án, lies in doing good, while anything that brings harm is sin. God demands of us no ceremonial service for His sake. The blood and flesh of a sacrificed animal do not reach Him.<sup>1</sup> His pleasure or wrath becomes materialized in what brings happiness or misery to man. These, in themselves, are His pleasure and anger. Therefore the acquisition of knowledge, especially knowledge of the good or evil measure of things on every plane, ought

<sup>1</sup> Holy Qur-án, xxii. 37.

## DENIAL OF THE QUR-ÁN

to be the first object of our life. It will bring our faculties to their true fruition. No Book, before the Qur-án, preached this truth so strongly. Knowledge was not in the list of virtues in ancient days. The Qur-án probed for the cause of evil in us and found knowledge to be the only remedy. And so we find to-day. Our knowledge of the material sciences brings prosperity, while our ignorance or disregard of moral laws creates misery and adversity.

### THE KINGDOM OF GOD

The Qur-án, at the advent of Islam, announced that the kingdom of heaven on the earth was at hand.<sup>1</sup> It was another name for true civilization, and in order to attain it, it was revealed to man for the first time that the rest of Nature had been created subservient to him, but that his ignorance of good morals had deprived him of his birthright. These morals were the morals of God Himself.

We had, therefore, to get knowledge of all things in heaven and on earth, and keep God before our eyes to act as our prototype. I have not found any other Book of wisdom, I say again, which teaches us to make the whole of Nature our study while keeping the Divine morals before us as our guide in life.

*(To be continued)*

---

## DENIAL OF THE QUR-ÁN: A LOGICAL INCONSISTENCY

By KHWAJA KAMALU 'D-DIN

"IF Moses is a Messenger of God then Muhammad has every claim to prophethood. He can safely be accepted as a Messenger from the Deity, if only for his crusade against drunkenness and the reform he effected. He banished all intoxicants from his people, and saved more than one-third of the human race from the curse of this poison which is now the cause of a large number of crimes in the West." Thus spoke a Liberal-

<sup>1</sup> Holy Qur-án, xvi. 1.

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

Christian gentleman, in Caxton Hall, London, to a large gathering which met in 1914 to denounce the increase of the liquor traffic in Algiers and Tunis. It was a just remark, since prophets do not come merely to do miracles and astonish people. Their mission, mainly, lies in reform. The Qur-án worked out wonderful reforms in many ways, inspiring the ideas necessary for the construction of a healthy society. We can only look to Divine agencies for reformation such as these and the following.

(1) *Monotheism.* Though belief in the unity of God had been preached in the world from time immemorial, yet the Qur-án so strongly insisted on Monotheism that it left the world no chance to deify any other person after Islam. Even those who had already been regarded as Divine were brought down from the throne of Godhood; and the race of Gods or of Son-Gods became extinct after the Qur-án. India is now ridding itself of polytheism and the Christian Church is tending in the same direction. All this is due to the Qur-án.

(2) *Messengership.* The Qur-án clearly taught that the followers of the Prophet should not regard him as a Divine Being, as they used to do before. "I am only a man like unto you," the Holy Prophet was inspired to say to his people. This disposed of all the polytheistic ideas which surround the personalities of the former prophets.

(3) *Equality amongst Men.* We cannot extol the Qur-án too highly for establishing this principle with such clarity. Accidents like birth, descent, race, and colour created several distinctions of superiority and inferiority in the human race which barred the way of universal progress. If Islam emphasized the Unity of God, it preached equality among men as its corollary. Those on the lowest rung of the social ladder quickly climbed to the top. Islam set out to demolish those racial prejudices which even to-day beset the larger portion of humanity. The ruling nations of the West maltreat their subject-races, and this has caused and is causing unrest throughout the whole world. But the worst type of such prejudice is to be found in Hinduism, which has cruelly victimized more than one-third of the population of India. They are the

## DENIAL OF THE QUR-ÁN

aborigines of the country and have been treated as untouchables for thousands of years. Even the shadow of such an one is taken as sufficient to pollute the thing on which it falls. How can a people boast of civilization if it gives countenance to the institution of untouchability?

In pursuance of the principle of equality in the human race, the Qur-án raised the status of woman, placing her on an equal footing with man. The Book also reformed the laws of slavery, abolishing all forms of it, with the exception of war captivity. Even in the case of political prisoners equal treatment in lodging, board, and clothing was ordered. The prisoner was allowed to find out means for obtaining his liberty. Since then the world has been working for the extinction of this ignoble institution. England, once notorious for her slave-trade, is not behind other nations in her efforts against slavery. But Muhammad was the first Prophet who spoke strongly against it.

(4) *Democracy.* Islam has rightly been styled "the father of democracy." Under the teachings of the Qur-án, Muhammad ruled his people on democratic principles, but the system was perfected in the days of his first four successors. Omar, the second Caliph, remarked that it was no government if the ruled people had no voice in it.

(5) *Sanctity of actions.* Almost all former religions spoke highly of beliefs though they may or may not become translated into actions. "Thy belief hath saved thee," as Jesus said to an old woman; but it was a mode of thought which proved pernicious to righteousness in the long run. Belief in the Blood was taken as sufficient to cleanse from sin. "Commit sins that grace may abound" became the rule in many cases. The Qur-án condemned all such theories. It gave prominence to actions which, accompanied by good beliefs, were declared to be the key to heavenly life. Islam also sanctified labour and denounced mendicancy.

(6) *Mediation or Intercession.* The principle of Intercession has not only enervated the power of action in the world, but has also weakened the sense of responsibility. Sins are committed on account of a belief in some kind of intercession.

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

The Qur-án for the first time deprecated the idea; "No one could intercede with Allah" was its general teaching. It no doubt has made an exception to the rule, but only in favour of godly people who would not speak against the will of the Lord. They might intercede in favour of people who, in the judgment of the Most Merciful, merited the Divine mercy.

(7) *All Messengers from God.* No nation has been without a religion. Though every religion traced its own origin to a Divine Source, yet it did not allow the same privilege to another. This caused trouble and discord among men, estranged one from another, and broke up the very fabric of fraternity in human society. The Qur-án came with a gospel of universal peace. It declared that all religions came from God, and that their founders drank equally from the fountain of God, but differences arose subsequently from human tampering with the Divine Word.

With the exception of the first principle, almost all the above-mentioned tenets owe their origin to the Qur-án. They inspire us with the noblest of ideas and create a most desirable civilization. If Moses and other persons were accepted as the Prophets of God by various nations, Muhammad has a stronger claim to our respect as God's Messenger to the whole world; and these tenets can safely substantiate his claims as such.

---

### MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

By Professor 'ABDU 'L-AHAD DĀWŪD, B.D.

#### XI

### THE SON OF MAN ACCORDING TO THE JEWISH APOCALYPSES

[The learned writer of this series is open to inquiries and questions on the points discussed by him in this article. Readers can address their letters to him care of the Editor, the *Islamic Review*, Woking, England.—ED. I.R.]

FROM what has been already discussed in these pages it will have been seen that the appellation "Barnasha," or "the Son of

## MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Man," is not a title like "Messiah," that could be applied to every prophet, high-priest, and legally anointed king; but that it is a *proper noun*, belonging exclusively to the Last Prophet. The Hebrew Seers, Sophees, and the Apocalypticists describe the Son of Man, who is to come in due time as appointed by the Almighty to deliver Israel and Jerusalem from the heathenish oppression and to establish the permanent kingdom for "the People of the Saints of the Most High." The Seers, the Sophees, foretell the advent of the Powerful Deliverer; they see him—*only* in a vision, revelation, and faith—with all his might and glory. No Prophet or Sophee *ever* said that he *himself* was "*the* Son of Man," and that he would "come again on the Last Day to judge both the quick and the dead," as the Nicene Creed puts it on the pretended authority of the Sayings of Jesus Christ.

The frequent use of the appellation in question by the evangelists indicates, most assuredly, their acquaintance with the Jewish Apocalypses, as also a firm belief in their authenticity and divine origin. It is quite evident that the Apocalypses bearing the names of Enoch, Moses, Baruch, and Ezra were written long before the Gospels; and that the name "Barnasha" therein mentioned was borrowed by the authors of the Gospels; otherwise its frequent use would be enigmatic and an incomprehensible—if not a meaningless—novelty. It follows, therefore, that Jesus either believed *himself* to be the Apocalyptic "Son of Man," or that he knew the Son of Man to be a person distinctly other than himself. If he believed *himself* to be the Son of Man, it would follow that either *he* or the *Apocalypticists* were in error; and in either case the argument goes most decidedly against Jesus Christ. For his error concerning his own personality and mission is as bad as the erroneous predictions of the Apocalypticists, whom he believed to be divinely inspired. Of course, this dilemmatic reasoning will lead us to a final conclusion unfavourable to himself. The only way to save Jesus from this dishonour is to look upon him as the Qur-án pictures him to us; and accordingly to attribute all the contradictory and incoherent statements about him in the Gospels to their authors or redactors.

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

Before discussing further the subject, "the Son of Man" as depicted in the Jewish Apocalypses, a few facts must be carefully taken into consideration. First, these Apocalypses not only do not belong to the canon of the Hebrew Bible, but also they are not even included among the Apocrypha or the so-called "Deutro-canonical" books of the Old Testament. Secondly, their authorship is not known. They bear the names of Enoch, Moses, Baruch, Ezra, but their real authors or editors seem to have known the final destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews under the Romans. These pseudonyms were chosen, not for fraudulent purposes, but out of a pious motive by the Sophees or Seers who composed them. Did not Plato put his own views and dialectics into the mouth of his master, Socrates? Thirdly, "these books," in the words of the Grand Rabbin Paul Haguenuer, "in an enigmatical, mystical, supernatural form, try to explain the secrets of the nature, the origin [sic] of God, the problems of good and evil, justice and happiness, the past and the future. The Apocalypse makes upon all these questions some revelations which surpass human understanding. Their principal personages are Enoch, Moses, Baruch, Ezra. These writings are evidently the product of the painful and disastrous epochs of Judaism."<sup>1</sup> Consequently they cannot be fully understood any more than the Apocalypse which bears the name of St. John the Apostle. Fourthly, these Apocalypses have been interpolated by the Christians. In the Book of Enoch "the Son of Man" is also called "the Son of Woman" and "the Son of God," thus interpolating the Church theory of Incarnation; surely no Jewish Seer would write "Son of God." Fifthly, it would be noticed that the Messianic doctrine is a later development of the old prophecies concerning the Last Apostle of Allah, as foretold by Jacob and other Prophets. It is only in the Apocrypha and the Apocalypses, and especially in the Rabbinical writings, that this "Last Deliverer" is claimed to descend from David. True, there are prophecies after the Babylonian captivity, and even after the deportation of the Ten Tribes into Assyria, about a "Son of David" who

<sup>1</sup> *Manuel de Littérature Juive*. Nancy, 1927.

## MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

would come to gather together the dispersed Israel. But these predictions were fulfilled only partly under Zorobabel—a descendant of King David. Then after the Greek invasion the same predictions were preached and announced, and we only see a Judah Maqbaya fighting with a slight success against Antiochus Epiphanes. Besides, this success was temporary and of no permanent value. The Apocalypses, which carry their visions down to the time after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus and Vespasian, foretell "the Son of Man" who will appear with great power to destroy the Roman power and the other enemies of Israel. Twenty centuries had to elapse before the Roman Empire was destroyed in the fifth century A.D. by a Turkish Emperor, Atilla—a pagan Hun—and finally by a Muslim Turk, the Fatih Muhammad II. But that power was completely destroyed, and for ever, in the lands promised to Ishmael by the Sultan of the Prophets, Muhammad al-Mustapha.

There remain two other observations which I cannot ignore in this connection. If I were a most ardent Zionist, or a most learned Rabbi, I would once more study this Messianic question as profoundly and impartially as I could. And then I would vigorously exhort my co-religionist Jews to desist from and abandon this hope for ever. Even if a "Son of David" should appear on the hill of Zion, and blow the trumpet, and claim to be the "Messiah," I would be the first to tell him boldly: "Please, Sire! You are too late! Don't disturb the equilibrium in Palestine! Don't shed blood! Don't let your angels meddle with these formidable aeroplanes! Whatever be the successes of your adventures, I am afraid they will not surpass those of your ancestors David, Zorobabel, and Judah Maccabaeus (Maqbaya)!" The great Hebrew conqueror was not David but Jesus bar Nun (Joshuah); he was the first Messiah, who instead of converting the pagan tribes of the Canaan that had shown so much hospitality and goodness to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, mercilessly massacred them wholesale. And Joshuah was, of course, a Prophet and the Messiah of the time. Every Israelite Judge during a period of three centuries or more was a Messiah and Deliverer. Thus we find

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

that during every national calamity, especially a catastrophe, a Messiah is predicted, and as a rule the deliverance is achieved always subsequent to the disaster and quite in an inadequate degree. It is a peculiar characteristic of the Jews that they alone of all the nations aspire, through the miraculous conquests by a Son of David, after a universal domination of the inhabitants of the globe. Their slovenliness and inertia are quite compatible with their unshaking belief in the advent of the "Lion of Judah." And that is, perhaps, the reason why they never attempt to concentrate all their national resources, energy, and force and make a united effort to become a self-governing people.

Now to the Christians who claim Jesus to be the prophetical Son of Man, I would venture to say: If he were the expected Deliverer of Israel he would have delivered that people from the Roman yoke, no matter if the Jews had believed in him or not. Deliverance *first*, gratitude and loyalty *after*; and not *vice versa*. A man must *first* be liberated from the hands of his captors by killing or frightening them, and *then* be expected to show his permanent attachment and devotion to the liberator. The Jews were not inmates of a hospital to be attended by physicians and nurses; they were practically prisoners in bonds and needed a hero to set them free. Their faith in God and in His Holy Law was as perfect as was that of their ancestors at the foot of Mount Sinai when He delivered it to Moses. They were not in need of a thaumaturgical prophet; all their history was interwoven with wonders and miracles. The raising to life of a dead Lazarus, the opening of the eyes of a blind Bartimaeus, or the cleansing of an outcaste leper, would neither strengthen their faith nor satiate their thirst for independence and liberty. The Jews rejected Jesus, not because he was not the Apocalyptic "Son of Man" or the Messiah—not because he was not a Prophet, for they knew very well that he did not claim to be the former, and that he was a Prophet—but because they hated him for his words: Messiah was not the Son of David, but his Lord.<sup>1</sup> This admission of the Synoptics confirms the statement in the

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxii. 44-46; Mark xii. 35-37; Luke xx. 41-44.

## MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Gospel of Barnabas, where Jesus is reported to have added that the Covenant will be fulfilled with the "Shiloah"—the Apostle of Allah—who will come from the family of Ishmael. For this reason the Talmudists describe Jesus as "the second Balaam"—that is, the Prophet who prophesies for the benefit of the heathen at the expense of the "chosen people."

It is quite clear, therefore, that the Jewish reception to, or their rejection of, Jesus was not the condition *sine qua non* to determine the nature of his mission. If he were the Final Deliverer he would have made the Jews submit to him, *nolens volens*, as Muhammad did. But the contrast between the circumstances in which each of those two Prophets found himself, and their work, knows no dimensions and no limits. Suffice it to say that Muhammad converted about ten million pagan Arabs into most sincere and ardent believers in the true God, and utterly uprooted idolatry in the lands where it had struck root. This he did, because he held in one hand the Law and in the other the Sceptre; the one was the Holy Qur-án and the other the emblem of power and government. He was hated, despised, persecuted by the noblest Arab tribe to which he belonged, and forced to flee for his life; but by the power of Allah he accomplished the greatest work for the cause of the true religion which no other Prophet before him had ever been able to do.

I shall now proceed to show that the Apocalyptic Son of Man was no other than Muhammad al-Mustapha.

i. The most cogent and important proof that the Apocalyptic *Barnasha* is Muhammad is given in a wonderful description in the vision of Daniel (vii.) already discussed in a previous article. In no way whatever the Barnasha therein described can be identified with any of the Maccabees' heroes or with Jesus; nor can the terrible Beast which was utterly killed and destroyed by that Son of Man be a prototype of Antiochus Epiphanes or the Roman Caesar, Nero. The culminating evil of that dreadful Beast was the "Little Horn," which uttered blasphemies against the Most High by associating with His essence three co-eternal divine persons and by its persecution of those who maintained the absolute oneness

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

of God. Constantine the Great is the person symbolized by that hideous Horn.

2. The Apocalypse of Enoch<sup>1</sup> foretells the appearance of the Son of Man at a moment when the small flock of the sheep, though vigorously defended by a ram, will be fiercely attacked by the birds of prey from above and by the carnivorous beast on land. Among the enemies of the little flock are seen many other goats and sheep that had gone astray. The lord of the flock, like a good shepherd, suddenly appears and strikes the earth with his rod or sceptre; it opens its mouth and swallows up the assailing enemy; chases and drives away from the pastures the rest of the pernicious birds and brutes. Then a sword is given to the flock as an emblem of power and the weapon of destruction. After which the flock is no longer headed by a ram but by a white bull with two large black horns.

This parabolical vision is transparent enough. From Jacob downwards the "chosen people" is represented symbolically by the flock of sheep. The descendants of Esau are described as boars. Other heathen peoples and tribes are represented in the vision, according to their respective characteristics, as ravens, eagles, vultures, and different species of brutes, all thirsty to suck the blood of the sheep or hungry to devour them. Almost all Biblical scholars agree that the vision indicates the painful period of the Maccabees and their bloody struggles with the armies of Antiochus Epiphanes until the death of John Hurcanus in 110 (?) B.C. This method of interpreting the vision is totally erroneous, and reduces the value of the whole book to nothing. That an antediluvian Prophet or a Seer should illustrate the history of the human race from a religious point of view, beginning with Adam, under the symbol of a White Bull, and ending with John Hurcanus or his brother Judah Maccabaeus (Maqbaya) as the Last White Bull, and then leave the flock of the "Believers" to be devoured

<sup>1</sup> I regret to say that the "Jewish Apocalypses" are inaccessible to me. The Encyclopædias give only a compendium of each book, which does not satisfy my purpose of examining the text. I know that the Irish Archbishop Laurence has translated this Apocalypse into English, but it is, unfortunately, beyond my reach.

## MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

again by the Romans, the Christians, and the Muslims to this very day, is ridiculous and shocking! In fact, the wars of the Maccabees and their consequence are not of such great significance in the history of the religion of God as to be the terminus of its development. None of the Maccabees was a Prophet; nor the founder of the so-called "Messianic reign" which the Gospels name the "Kingdom of God." Besides, this interpretation of the vision is inconsistent with the characters represented in the drama under the figurative symbols of the master of the flock, sceptre in hand, the Ram, and the White Bull; and then with the large sword given to the shepherds with which they kill or drive away the impure animals and birds. Furthermore, this Christian interpretation of Enoch's Apocalypse does not explain the mystical transplantation or the transportation of the terrestrial Jerusalem into a country farther to the south; and what meaning can be given to the new House of God built on the spot of the old one, larger and higher than the former sacred edifice, to which flock not only the believing sheep—the faithful Jews—but also the various pagan nationalities that have embraced the religion of the Son of Man who destroyed the enemies with his Sceptre or Rod! For all these particular acts and representations are seen and described in this dramatic vision. The chain that links together the events depicted in this figurative language begins with Adam and ends in the person of the Prophet of Mecca! There are several cogent arguments to prove this assertion.

(a) The two divisions of the sheep indicate the people of the Scriptures, whether Jews or Christians, among whom were those who were believers in the unity of God, and those who made Jesus and the Holy Spirit also gods equal and consubstantial with God. The Seer distinguishes the believers from the apostates. The Gospels report that on the day of the Last Judgment "the sheep will be separated from the goats,"<sup>1</sup> which indicates the same view. As to the symbolical Ram, we may understand thereby Arius or some spiritual Unitarian leader for the true Nassara and the chief Rabbi for the faithful

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxv. 32-46, etc.

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

Jews—because they both had the same common enemy. If we identify Constantine with the evil Horn, we may justly identify Arius with the Ram. In fact, Arius is entitled to this dignity because he headed the larger group in the Council of Nicea and vigorously defended the true religion against the monstrous doctrines of Trinitarian and Sacramentarian Churches. From a strictly Muslim point of view the Jews, from the moment they rejected and condemned Jesus Christ to death, ceased to be the “chosen people,” and that honourable title was given only to those who believed in his apostleship.

(b) The Son of Man who saved the flock of sheep from its various enemies whom he sent down into the bosom of the earth by striking vehemently his pastoral staff on it, and gave a strong sword to the sheep to slaughter the impure brutes and birds of prey, was decidedly Muhammad. The sceptre (in Hebrew “shebet”—rod, staff) is the emblem of sovereignty, jurisdiction, and administration. The little sceptre accorded by God to the tribe of Judah<sup>1</sup> was taken away, and a stronger and larger one was given to the Apostle of Allah (the “Shiloah”) in its place. It is indeed marvellous how this prophetic vision of the Seer was literally fulfilled when Muhammad’s sceptre became the emblem of the Muslim sovereignty over all the countries—in Egypt, Assyria, Chaldea, Syria, and Arabia—where the people of God were persecuted by the pagan powers of those countries and by the foreign heathen powers of the Medo-Persians, Greeks, and Romans! What a glorious fulfilment of the vision is it when the flock of sheep, for many centuries having been exposed to the merciless beaks and claws of the birds of prey and to the sharp and terrible teeth and claws of the beasts, was now equipped with a large sword to defend which every Muslim carried until the blood of the Saints and Martyrs<sup>2</sup> was equitably avenged.

(c) *The White Bull.* Until Ishmael, all the Prophets are represented as white bulls; but from Jacob downwards the princes of the chosen people appear in the form of rams. The universal religion had been reduced to a national one; and the Emperor had become a petty chief. Here is again another

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xl ix. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Rev. vi. 9-11.

## MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

amazing fulfilment of the vision in the Mohammedan era. The leaders or the patriarchs of the ancient international religion are represented as white bulls, and those of the Muslim Commanders of the Faithful also as white bulls, with the only distinction that the latter have large black horns, emblem of twofold power, spiritual and temporal. Among all clean quadrupeds there is nothing more beautiful and noble than the white bull, and more so especially when it is crowned with a pair of large black horns. It looks most majestic and full of grace! It is very remarkable that the Imām of the believers, whether a Khalipha or a Sultan, or possessing both titles, is distinguished and perceived day and night by the purity of his faith and actions and by the solidity of his power and majesty at the head of the vast and innumerable hosts of the faithful composed of all races and languages! The vision expressly avows the entrance and admission of the apostates and unbelievers into the flock. Jews—thousands of Jews—Christians, and Sabians, as well as millions of Arabs and other heathen nationalities, believed in the oneness of Allah and embraced Islam. In this connection it is worthy of note that all the blood shed in the wars of Badr, Ohud, and other campaigns led personally by the Prophet Muhammad, could not exceed one-hundredth of the blood shed by Joshua. Yet not a single instance of cruelty or injustice can be proved against the Apostle of Allah. He was clement, noble, magnanimous, and forgiving. This is why he is *alone* among all the human race represented in all prophetic visions “the Son of Man,” like the first man before his fall!

(d) The Son of Man founds the Kingdom of Peace, the capital of which is no longer the old Jerusalem, but the new Jerusalem—the “Dāru ’s-Salām,” the “city or court of Peace.” The Sophee or Seer in this wonderful vision narrates how the terrestrial Jerusalem is lifted up and transplanted in a southern country; but a new Temple, larger and higher than the first one, is built upon the ruins of the old edifice! Gracious God! how wonderfully all this was accomplished by Thy most Illustrious and Holy Servant Muhammad! The new Jerusalem is none other than Mecca, for it is in a southern country, its

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

two hills, the "Marwa" and "Sapha," bear the same names as those of Moriah and Zion, of the same root and signification but originally earlier. "Irushalem" or "Urshalem" of old becomes a city of "Light and Peace." It is for this reason, too, that Mecca as the seat of the sacred ka'aba became the "Qibla"—the direction towards which the Muslims turn their faces at prayer. Here every year tens of thousands of pilgrims from all Muslim countries assemble, visit the Holy Ka'aba, offer sacrifices, and renew their fidelity to Allah and promise to lead a new life worthy of a Musulman. Not only Mecca, but also Medina and the territory surrounding them, has become sacred and inviolable, and forbidden to any non-Muslim man or woman! It was in fulfilment of this vision of Idris or Enoch, too, that the second Khalipha, Omar, rebuilt the Sacred Mosque at Jerusalem on the hill of Moriah, on the spot of the Temple of Solomon! All these marvellously prove that the vision was seen by a Seer inspired by God, who saw the Muslim events in a far-distant future. Could Rome or Byzantium claim to be the New Jerusalem? Can the Pope or any schismatic Patriarch claim to be the Apocalyptic White Bull with two large horns? Can Christianity claim to be the Kingdom of Peace (Islam = "Shalom") while it makes Jesus and the Holy Ghost coeval and consubstantial with the Absolute One God? Most decidedly not.

(e) In those chapters dealing with the Kingdom of Peace, the Messiah is called Son of Man, but in the description of the Last Judgment which follows at the end of this Reign of Islam or Peace he is called "Son of Woman" and "Son of God," and made to share with God in the Judgment of the World. It is admitted by all scholars that these extravagant and foolish statements are *not* of Jewish origin but belong to the Christian imaginations, inserted and interpolated by them.

The other Apocalypses, those which bear the names of Moses, Baruch, Ezra, the Jubilees, and the Oracula Sibylliana, should be studied impartially, for it is then that they, like those of Daniel and Enoch, will not only be understood but also prove to be fulfilled in Muhammad and Islam.

## NOTES

## NOTES

### The Sword of Muhammad.

The *Muslim World*, the notorious Christian quarterly edited by Dr. Zwemer, in its issue for April 1931, reproduces a coloured picture of the sword which is associated in folk-lore with the name of Ali, the fourth Caliph. The picture, we are told, has been procured from China, where a few ignorant Muslims, it may be, use it for an amulet. The editor, however, pounces upon it as a plea for fresh propaganda against Islam, and uses, or rather misuses, his abundant literary talent in attempting to prove, in the course of a long article, that the sword originally belonged to the Prophet Muhammad, and that it was as much a part of his legacy to his followers as were his alleged warlike teachings. Dr. Zwemer may well be congratulated on his intelligence in perceiving how much more readily than verbal quibbles of a literary nature, the coloured picture of a sword is likely to attract the popular attention. But with all his resourcefulness he is unable to cite, from the huge mass of traditions, reliable and unreliable, one single instance of the Prophet cutting off the head of an unbeliever with that fictitious sword. Yet in spite of this he gives to his article the mischievous title of "The Sword of *Muhammad* and Ali." He further quotes Carlyle as questioning the theory of the sword as applied to the religion of Muhammad—"Sword indeed! But where will you get your sword?" (*Heroes and Hero-worship*). It is strange that instead of attempting any reply to the point raised by the Sage of Chelsea, the doctor simply says, "However he got it, Islam has made much of it and woven legends around the battlefield of Badr." Had we not known this to be a wilful misrepresentation we should have attempted to enlighten the doctor on the circumstances in which that memorable battle, or any other battle in the lifetime of the Prophet, took place, as well as on the attitude of the Prophet towards those ruthless enemies of freedom and progress with whom his followers had most reluctantly to contend. So long, however, as defensive wars are not abhorrent to pious Christians and other upholders of the doctrine of non-

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

resistance to evil, the principles of war, as enunciated by the Qur-án and illustrated by the actions of the Prophet, will surely stand as the best guides to humanity, and the sword of Muhammad need no vindication, though personally he too disliked it intensely and never resorted to it on his own behalf.

### The Sword of Jesus.

But what about the Prince of Peace—the Son of God in Dr. Zwemer's cult? Has not the sword been, far more truly, part and parcel of the religion that goes under his name? Let us quote Carlyle again—"We do not find, of the Christian religion either, that it always disdained the sword, when once it had got one. Charlemagne's conversion of the Saxons was not by preaching." What has Dr. Zwemer to say to this? Does he ask Muslims to forget the days of the Crusades and the Holy Inquisition? Neither can the Gospels escape the charge of being responsible for these horrors of Christian fanaticism. Do we not read in the New Testament—"Then said he unto them. But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one"? (Luke xxii. 36). In face of this utterance of Jesus as given in the Gospels no Christian can have the hardihood to assert that he would not have waged war against his enemies had but circumstances permitted. That he did not succeed in organizing armed resistance, owing in part to the lack of faithful adherence among his followers but mostly to the dread of the disciplined forces of the Roman Government, does not in any way exonerate him from this warlike attitude. Again, if he did not actually lead an army at the time, his more or less passive approval of the wielding of the sword was more than sufficient for the generations that followed, and found themselves in a position to do it safely and on a sufficiently large scale to spell extinction to the opposition once and for all. The following verses will bear us out in what we say:

"And, behold, one of them which were with Jesus stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and struck a servant of the high priest's, and smote off his ear.

## NOTES

" Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword " (Matt. xxvi. 51, 52).

" And one of them that stood by drew a sword, and smote a servant of the high priest, and cut off his ear.

" And Jesus answered and said unto them . . ." (Mark xiv. 47, 48).

" And one of them smote the servant of the high priest, and cut off his right ear.

" And Jesus answered and said, Suffer ye thus far. And he touched his ear, and healed him " (Luke xxii. 50, 51).

" Then Simon Peter having a sword drew it, and smote the high priest's servant, and cut off his right ear. . . .

" Then said Jesus unto Peter, Put up thy sword into the sheath: the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it? " (John xviii. 10, 11).

It is quite clear from these verses:

(1) that all the four Gospel writers agree with regard to the use of the sword for Jesus' safety;

(2) that there is no condemnation, as we understand it, of the act from the mouth of Jesus (it is well to remember here how the Jesus of the Gospels unsparingly denounces the Jews for their wrongful conduct and how these denunciations often pass the limits of ordinary restraint);

(3) that the words " Suffer ye thus far " indicate approval, eloquent in its pithiness; and

(4) that this act of violence was a direct consequence of the rousing words of Jesus in Luke xxii. 36-38.

To the great misfortune of the world these hints of their man-god were made too much use of by the Christians, and but for them religion would have been spared much of the calumny which it has now to suffer at the hands of sceptics and free-thinkers. The Protestants who, after all, form a minority in Christendom, do, it is true, denounce the Holy Wars, as the Crusades were called; but even if this be so, no one can say what would have been the attitude even of these liberal-minded denominations towards those exhibitions of savagery, had they succeeded in their object.

### The Sword in Legend.

It is unfortunate that the cause of truth and justice shall have, every now and then, to be vindicated by physical force. The spirit which we call chivalry, and which is as essential to-day as it ever was, although its form be changed, has constantly played its part among all peoples and in all ages; while the spirit of admiration, on the other hand, has led the nations to commemorate their respective heroes in such ways as seemed appropriate. In ancient times the conditions of society required of its champions, as we call them, that they should manifest their chivalry in single combat or hand-to-hand fighting, and it is difficult to say if the methods used in our own days mark, in any way, a real advance on that practised by our ancestors. However that may be, seeing that fighting was the only method known to them, certain weapons of war or beasts of burden came, naturally, to be associated with the names of their heroes. Thus we read, in the records of this nation or that, of a sword or a mace, a horse or an elephant as partaking of the celebrity pertaining to their possessors. This fact is universal, and there is scarcely a community whose history, recorded or traditional, does not tell us of a weapon or animal so distinguished. Unfortunately, the first few generations of Christians were not in a position to exhibit this spirit of chivalry, and perhaps Christianity was feeling uneasy by reason of this drawback in its national history, when, to its great relief, the pagan peoples entering into its fold brought with them their own traditions of bravery and chivalry to reinforce the timid faith of Jesus. Since then, much intellectual and imaginative diligence has been spent in exalting the deeds of the Christianized heroes of pagan times and with them certain of the implements and trappings of war. The histories of the words "champion," "chivalry," and "knighthood" are inextricably connected with the sword and with fighting; why, then, should the poor Muslims alone be blamed for weaving a legend round a sword and a battle which actually brought to them the first hopes for their existence? If the sword Excalibur and the battles of King Arthur, which are nothing but fiction as far as the history of Christianity

## NOTES

is concerned, can be selected as their themes by authors of repute among the Protestant sections of Christendom in our own enlightened times, why the Arab Muslims of the sixth or seventh century, with whom also the spirit of chivalry was not an absolutely vicious feeling, should be reproached at all for celebrating the praises of a horse or a sword or a warrior hero passes our understanding.

### The Mysteriousness of the Christian Attitude.

To us, the religious outlook of the Christians has always appeared mysterious. Christianity has never been chary of violent methods, yet the very thought of Muhammad as a soldier leaves the Christian gasping with horror. And is it not a fact that even now the armies of Christian nations are blessed by their Churches ere they go to war? The Muslim world, even in the heyday of its existence, was never faced with such a thing as the question of disarmament; and we fear that if the general opinion of the world be not guided by feelings other than those which emanate from the Churches, the days of Ferdinand and Philip of Spain are only too likely to be repeated in our own time. The unscrupulous manner in which the bearers of the message of the Cross are using every sort of unfair and dishonest means for the purpose of bringing Islam and the Muslims into disrepute leaves no doubt as to the existence of such a possibility. It seems that the whole anger of the evangelizing forces against the Muslims lies in the latter's refusal passively to surrender to the ruthless vandalism that has sought, in the name of Jesus, to stifle the voice of truth that rose from the sandy plains of Arabia. If this surmise of ours be not correct, the Christian attitude towards war in Islam must always remain a profound mystery.

### A Lesson for Muslims.

Bold as the mischievous propaganda of Dr. Zwemer and his associates may seem, it yet has this lesson for us Muslims: That we must set ourselves to develop a far more sensitive conception of religious honour than we possess at the present moment. It is more or less our own indifference that is

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

responsible for these malicious misrepresentations, for to mislead is possible only when there is ignorance to be misled. If Dr. Zwemer and such as he are tempted to misrepresent Islam it is because the world at large is lamentably ignorant concerning the teachings and history of our Faith. And who is to be held responsible for this deplorable state of things if not we ourselves? The Muslim community stands self-condemned in this matter. But better late than never. Let us atone for our past negligence by devoting ourselves heart and soul to the dissemination of knowledge about Islam. If the changed condition of society makes it difficult to do so orally, a very easy and efficient method is offered by literature. The distribution of suitable literature among the people ignorant of Islam thus opens for us a convenient way of fulfilling the Divine Commandment—"And strive against them a mighty striving with it [i.e. Qur-án]" (Qur-án, xxv. 5).

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

### NO PRIESTHOOD IN ISLAM

[The following letter upon this subject was sent by Maulana Haroun Mustapha Léon to the *Daily Telegraph*, but was not inserted therein—no reason being assigned for its non-insertion!]

Possibly, however, its non-publication arose from the disinclination of the editor to admit the crass ignorance on Islamic matters of the members of the editorial staff who composed the "Scare-head" complained of. In this respect the editor followed the dictum of the late John Hollingshead: "A journalist is *nothing* if not infallible. He should never allude to the past, unless it serves his purpose!"<sup>1</sup>

Its non-insertion, on the other hand, may be in accordance with what appears to be a general conspiracy, rife amongst practically all English journals, to keep the British public in ignorance of the fundamental truths of Islam.

The following is the text of the letter:]

May 11, 1931.

In your issue of Saturday last, in reporting the law-case wherein the Imām of the Woking Mosque obtained a verdict of £500<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hollingshead, *Plain English*, p. 182 (pub. 1880).

<sup>2</sup> In the court of Mr. Justice Branson, King's Bench Division, High Court of Justice, London, on May 8, 1931, the jury awarded Abdul Majid, Imām of the Mosque, Woking, £500 damages against an

## CORRESPONDENCE

damages against a person who had libelled him, you describe the plaintiff as the *Imām* "or *priest*," and style him the "*Reverend*." Both these terms are inappropriate and incorrect so far as that official is concerned, and misleading with regard to the Islamic Faith.

In Islam there is not, never has been, or never can be, any *priesthood*.

The term *Imām* is applied to one whose leadership or example is to be followed—a pattern, a model.

The term is used in the *Quran shareef* in each of these senses (Suras II. 118; xvii. 73; xxv. 74; xxxvi. 11).

The *Imām* is also the leader of prayers in any mosque. Each mosque, however small, has its *Imām*.

In Turkey, the village Hodja, or schoolmaster, generally acts as *Imām*. He is paid (generally from income derived from endowments) for *teaching*, but not for *leading the prayers*.

The office of *Imām* is not, in any sense, a sacerdotal one, the *Imām* not being set apart with any ceremony, as in the case of a Christian presbyter, nor is the office hereditary, as in the case of the Hindu Brahmins. The position of *Imām*, in this sense, is not unlike the *Sheliah Zibbur* of the Jewish synagogue, who acted as the delegate of the congregation and was the chief reader of prayers in their name—this function being regarded as a most honourable one and delegated only to the worthiest men of the congregation.

As previously mentioned, there is no priesthood in Islam, but no congregation of Muslim worshippers can assemble without one of the party taking the lead in the prayers by standing in front and thus acting as *Imām* for the assembly.

The rules laid down on this subject are given in the Hadees and, briefly, are as follows:

"When there are three persons, one of them must act as *Imām*, and the other two follow him, and the most worthy of them to act as such is he who repeats the *Qur-án* best."

"When any of you acts as *Imām* to others, he must be concise in his prayers, because there are decrepit, aged, and sick persons amongst them, and when any of you says his prayers alone he may be as prolix as he pleases."

The term "*reverend*" is not applied in Islam to any person acting as *Imām*. If he is a learned man (one well versed in the knowledge of the *Qur-án* or the Islamic Laws) he should be styled *Maulavi* ("learned").

HAROUN MUSTAPHA LÉON, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D.

"Mir Alim" [By special *irade* of H.I.M. the late Sultan Abdul-Hamid Khan, Sultan of Turkey, Khalif of the Faithful, Emir-al-Mumeneen (May Allah be pleased with him, Amin!)].

---

Englishman, Mr. Abdullah Day, of 20, Regent Square, London, W.C. 1, formerly Secretary of the Western Islamic Association, for causing to have printed a defamatory letter in the Indian daily, the *Zamindar*, dated March 12, 1930.—ED. I.R.

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

[Below is a letter from J. L. B., whose previous letter has already been printed in July, 1931, issue.—ED. I.R.]

To THE IMĀM,  
The Mosque,  
Woking.

DEAR SIR,—

At last, having finished my examination and returned home for the Long Vacation, I can settle down to write to you.

I have carefully read through the copies of the *Islamic Review* and the two booklets which you so kindly sent me, and out of this reading several points have arisen. In the first place, I had better speak of the things in Islam which have very favourably impressed me.

(1) The unity of God. I have studied Christianity and especially Roman Catholicism, and my understanding has always refused to give any belief to the doctrine of the Trinity. Theologians have told us that it is not a matter for reason or logic—by faith alone could we hope to comprehend the mystery: a poor evasive reply which did absolutely nothing to win me over. In Roman Catholicism the isolated splendour of God is dimmed and we are never granted a vision of Him in all His solitary grandeur. The Virgin Mary and an innumerable host of saints cluster around Him, standing between us and His glory. The absence of symbolism in Islam is also very refreshing: crucifixes, statues, rosaries, etc. etc., seem to detract from the dignity of man—it is as if he cannot conceive the First Cause except through these cheap tawdry gewgaws.

(2) The absence of a definite organized priesthood. The calm arrogation of supernatural powers by a small class has always angered me, and my sympathies go out to anti-clericals, such as Voltaire and Anatole France. An hierarchy is intolerable. This links up with the question of confession—yet another barrier between ourselves and God. Always in Catholicism man has to rely on the priest for the greatest benefits offered by religion.

(3) The practical outlook of Islam. More than any other religion it seems to have remembered earth whilst never forgetting heaven. The commandments of the Qur-án are not fantastic impossible ways of life: they can be practised, and could, I think, form the basis of a communal law which would be workable and satisfactory in every respect. A man can live an honourable useful life on earth and yet be a saintly Muslim. Islam does not require its followers to withdraw from life and follow a code of exaggerated asceticism. It recognizes that a man has a body as well as a soul, and whereas Christianity tried to castrate the human race, Islam recognizes the power of the sexual impulse and realizes its inherent nobility if restrained and disciplined.

## CORRESPONDENCE

In all these things I would follow Islam, but this is not the end of the story.

I know no Greek, but am a fairly able Latin scholar, and have read most of the classics of Greece and Rome—in the original texts and in translations. My work at Cambridge brings me into close contact with English literature, and for my own pleasure I read a considerable amount of French. And so the whole of my culture has its roots in the Western world, and at the moment it seems as if it would be an act of treason to give my allegiance to Islam. I have read many books of Eastern travel, from Burton and Doughty to Mr. Bertram Thomas's very recent book, in an endeavour to find out the secret of the East's fascination for me, but although it exerts a potent spell over my soul I always turn back to Europe in the end. When my heart is stirred by Virgil's magic cadences, when the passion of Catullus moves me or the warm light-hearted paganism of Ovid laughs back at me, when I see the white ruined splendour of the Parthenon or the serene beauty of Praxiteles' Cnidian Venus (now veiled so as not to offend the papal eye!)—when I have these emotional experiences I feel that the sources of my life must flow from Olympus and the Seven Hills rather than from the sandy wastes of Arabia. Yet I am willing to believe that the East has much to offer me, and that all the circumstances of my birth and education have combined to make it extremely difficult for me to approach it with an unbiased mind—I lack the key which will open the door.

At present I am too inclined to judge Islam by its followers who, you must admit, have been guilty of a great deal of intolerance and fanaticism. I know Christianity can show an equally bad record—probably worse—and it is something which ought not to affect my criticism of any religion, but it certainly does exert a subconscious influence.

How should I be treated if I became a Muslim? Should I be an outsider, regarded with a certain amount of suspicion? However profound my sincerity, I somehow feel that I could never be on exactly the same footing as one born and reared in the Faith. Probably this feeling of mine is quite without grounds, yet it is very real to me.

What are there of outward observances in Islam? I know of the five daily prayers and the month of fasting, and, whilst I appreciate the motive behind the latter, the former seem as if they might easily degenerate into mere formality, and when I read of them I wondered if there were other ceremonies of a similar nature.

What truth is there in Islamic Fatalism? Christian writers maintain that Islam is a static religion possessing no power of development, and that both it and its believers tend to stagnate, for all initiative is destroyed by a pessimistic fatalism. Now I cannot believe in this fatalism if it says that every future action of an individual is already decided by the decree of a Supreme Power, and that man cannot escape from living on through a life in which

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

his every action is preordained. But I gladly accept a belief which asserts that a man's life is wholly dependent on hereditary influences, on education, and on environment; and that if we knew *everything* about X we should be able to forecast with absolute certainty which path X would take when he came to a cross-roads in his career. Schopenhauer, in Section 9 of his *Fragments of the History of Philosophy*, very clearly states the dilemma of the Christian who believes in God the Creator and in Free-Will, for, as he says, "free being and created being are two mutually destructive and therefore contradictory qualities."

And about the language? Is a knowledge of Arabic essential? The necessity of learning another language by no means frightens me: in fact, I should rather enjoy it.

To conclude: I am greatly impressed by Islam. Up to now philosophy and literature have occupied most of my time, but with the passing of every month I come to feel the need of a religion more and more, and I believe that in Islam I shall find that for which I am seeking. As yet I am hesitating before taking the plunge, but I grow more and more convinced that Islam is going to claim me for its own. I shall be spending a month in Germany towards the end of this vacation, and there, quite cut off from England, I shall make my decision. And when I return to Cambridge in October the question will be finally settled. If I have decided rightly what shall I have to do to become a true Muslim? How shall I enter into the great brotherhood of Islam? And meanwhile, how can I best be occupying my time?

In the May number of the *Review* there is a photograph of Miss Browne. Is it possible for me to be put in touch with her? Or with anyone who has recently been converted? I should like to discuss their and my own experiences with them.

I must, in conclusion, apologize for firing all these questions at you: I realize this letter is enough to try anyone's patience.

Yours sincerely,

J. L. B.

[*Reply to above*]

THE MOSQUE,  
WOKING, SURREY.

June 17, 1931.

DEAR BROTHER,—

Assalamo Alaikum!

We are in receipt of your letter of the 14th, and we thank you for the frank nature of your discussion; it breathes a genuine sincerity of heart which is sure to find light. We are not in the least tired of such discussions. The Qurânic verse is too explicit for us to entertain any such feeling. "Call to the way of your Lord with wisdom and goodly exhortation, and have disputations with them in the best manner; surely your Lord best knows those who go

## CORRESPONDENCE

astray from His path, and He knows best those who follow the right way" (xvi. 125).

You, sir, are a highly cultured and discerning gentleman; so I will simply endeavour to help you with suggestions to enable you to come to a right decision with regard to the perplexities you have mentioned in your letter.

(1) You speak of your intellectual upbringing in Western culture. In the first place I would point out that for the last 1,500 years Europe has been paying spiritual homage (however corrupt its expression may have been) to Jesus the Easterner, never once thinking in the terms in which you seem to be thinking. Milton was the child of Greek and Roman philosophies, but inspired by the ideal of Christianity. He, and men like him, employed the intellectual materials of the pagan civilizations in forwarding the cause of Christianity. There have been many Muslim scholars who have done the like for Islam. The Renaissance in Europe which called present-day Western civilization—built on the ruins of the defunct cultures of Rome and Greece—into existence was practically inaugurated by the Muslims in Spain. It is by mere accident that Islam, in its first onrush, did not make a wholesale conversion of any European nation, and is now consequently regarded as an Eastern faith. "The Lord of the East as well as of the West" is the oft-repeated title of the Qurânic God. That phase of Islamic civilization which is known as Saracenic is now defunct, and the faith of Islam is waiting for a new cultural manifestation, probably from the West, as the prophetic words of Muhammad suggest.

(2) You refer to the dark chapters which Islamic history holds—in common with all other religions, as you rightly observe. But its bright chapters excel those of all other religions. This may perhaps serve as a deciding factor. The faith of Jesus is not responsible for Judas. Moreover, there is a fundamental difference between the history of Islam and that of Christianity. The nearer its inception the more shining is the history of Islam; whereas the more remote from and opposed to its founders, the more glorious are the achievements of Christianity, or rather of Christian peoples. So long as we live in this world of matter, surcharged with evil tendencies, we have to look on at the abuse of even the best things. The right attitude would be not to indulge in cruel criticisms as a spectator but to uphold the cause of Truth as a conscientious participator, and try to crush the abuse by exhibiting its right use.

(3) With regard to the status of a new convert to Islam. In spite of all the degeneracy of the Muslim peoples, the birthright in Islam has not yet been allowed to sink into promiscuity. From our experience in India we can give you definite assurance in this respect. Alike from cultural, political, and religious points of view, Muslims are more prone to look down upon the idolatrous Hindus with their filthy practices than they are upon the Christian Europeans. Nevertheless, a convert from Hinduism has never found any difficulty in marrying into his own status in the Muslim com-

## ISLAMIC REVIEW

munity. The attitude of suspicion and doubt towards Europeans is not due to difference in religion, but to the political attitude of Europe towards the Islamic peoples, and the actions of Rutters and Lawrences have further accentuated this feeling. So, humanly speaking, the Muslim peoples are not much to blame. But even this attitude of theirs is fast changing in view of the fact that a large number of Europeans have since been known to be *bona-fide* followers of Islam. Those very Muslims in India and Africa who, at the time of Lord Headley's first visit to Egypt, regarded him as a British spy, hailed him as one of their religious heads when he visited their respective countries for the second time. I wonder if you have read our note on "Pan-Islamism" in the March-April issue of our *Review*? Given an equal amount of knowledge of the theology of Islam, a new convert is rather more honoured than a born Muslim. From our personal experience we can tell you that it sends a thrill to the mind of an average Muslim in Eastern lands when he learns that someone has newly joined the faith; and it makes him prepared for a sacrifice which even the distress of his nearest relatives cannot call forth.

(4) With reference to the institutions of Islam degenerating into mere formalities—I am afraid the inference is much the same as holding that for the vast number of unthinking bookworms in these days, the art of writing books is responsible. No method of instruction can guarantee the development of assimilating power in man and, still, there must be some routine for the acquirement of any culture. The prayers of Islam have seen vast masses of unthinking devotees, no doubt, but they have also lifted up the souls of thousands of saints and holy persons holding communion with God, in the present as in the past. The Qurán has taken all possible precautions against the catastrophe you apprehend. "It is not righteousness that you turn your faces towards the East and the West, but righteousness is that one should believe in Allah and the last day and the angels and the book and the prophets, and give away wealth out of love for Him to the near of kin and the orphans and the needy and the wayfarer and the beggars and for (the emancipation of) the captives, and keep up prayer and pay the poor-rate; and the performers of their promise when they make a promise, and the patient in distress and affliction and in time of conflict—these are they who are true (to themselves), and these are they who guard (against evil)" (ii. 177). In plain words, it means that the form has its own place, but the culture of the spirit should always be the purpose before it, and the spirit thus cultivated should manifest itself in practical life. With reference to this particular institution of prayer the Book says: "So woe to the praying ones, who are unmindful of their prayers, who do (good) to be seen, and withhold alms" (cvi. 4-7). To our mind prayer is less liable to be reduced to a dead formalism in Islam than it is in Christianity, because in Islam it is almost an individual and private routine and, moreover, there is no compulsion excepting that of a



